

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 7-26 and 50-61 were indicated as elected, and claims 1-6, 27-49 and 62-67 were indicated as withdrawn. By the present response, claims 1-6, 27-49 and 62-67 have been canceled, and claims 7, 17 and 50 have been amended. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 7-26 and 50-61 will be pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Objections of Claims

The Office Action summarizes claim 17 was objected to due to certain informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 has been amended to read “administrator for the administrative domain” to correct the informality. Applicants now believe that claim 17 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request the objection of claim 17 to be withdrawn.

Objections of Specification and Abstract

The Office Action summarizes the Specification and Abstract was objected to because the specification and abstract were in a font that is difficult to read and because some of the text may have been missing. Applicants would observe that a photocopy of the same document in Applicants’ file appears fine, but nevertheless, respectfully submit that the specification and abstract are being re-submitted with this response and respectfully request the objection of to be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action summarizes claim 7 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis issue.

The Office Action summarizes claims 7-10, 13, 17-21, 23-26 and 50-59 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that “arbitrary users” refers to groups formed in arbitrary sets and not formed from sets that are inflexible in definition (*See*, page 8, lines 1-5). Applicants therefore submit that the term as adequately defined in the application, and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action summarizes claims 7-9, 17-19, 25, 26, 50, 55-57 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,366,913 (hereinafter, “Fitler”). All of the claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons summarized below.

Claim 7 recites a computer implemented method for managing user information associated with a user community comprising specifying the user community into at least one arbitrary group of users, forming an administrative domain from the at least one arbitrary group of users and granting administrative privileges to an administrator for managing the administrative domain.

Claim 17 recites a computer implemented method for providing delegated administration of a user community comprising all the steps of claim 7, as well as delegating the granted administrative privileges from the administrator to another administrator the administrative domain.

Claim 50 recites a computer implemented system including a user community administration tool for providing delegated administration of a user community comprising a means for performing the steps recited in claim 17.

Claim 55 recites a computer-readable medium storing computer instructions which when executed in a computer system performs a process comprising the steps of claim 17.

Fitler fails to teach, *inter alia*, forming an administrative domain from at least one arbitrary group of users and granting administrative privileges to an administrator for managing an administrative domain. Instead Fitler teaches a method for maintaining a dynamic group list. The dynamic group is determined by checking any user attribute. A user may have various attributes and may belong to various groups. However, the administrative domain remains single for all of the groups, thus making the group dynamic. *See*, Fitler column 3, lines 20-35. Applicants have carefully reviewed column 6, lines 43 through 47 and column 8, lines 1 through 37, relied upon by the Examiner, as well as the remainder of the reference. Nowhere does Fitler teach, suggest or disclose forming one administrative domain for a corresponding group of arbitrary users and granting administrative privileges to an administrator for managing the administrative domain.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7, 17, 50 and 55 and claims depending therefrom are allowable and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action summarizes claims 10-16, 20-24, 54 and 58-61 as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitler in view of by U.S. Patent Number 6,539,379 (hereinafter, "Vora").

The claims rejected under this section all depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 7, 17, 50 and 55 discussed above. Vora does nothing to obviate the deficiencies of Fitler discussed above. Consequently, all of the dependent claims are believed to be patentable both by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim,

as well as for the subject matter they separately recite. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the dependent claims on this basis are requested.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/26/2006

PSY
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545